

Budget Results Council  
MEETING NOTES  
February 17, 1999  
Forrestal Building  
Washington, D.C.

Attendees: Tom Baranouskas-PNNL, Jeffrey Fernandez-LLNL, Lyn Henderson-HQ, Jon Mathis-HQ, Brian Morishita-LMITCO, Terry Olsen- LMITCO, John Pescosolido, SRO, Betty Smedley-HQ

Not present: Eli Bronstein-EM, Ralph Delorenzo-SC, Tony Lane-DP, Judy Penry-ORO, Chuck Roy-NE

- Smedley:  
BMIS – Preparing to launch its system development life cycle. Includes both field office and CFO representation. It is intended to interface BMIS (which replaces MARSS/DISCAS) with the EIS and data warehouse. The business case for this system is currently being completed. Participants for the requirements gathering are being sought. Ike Smith presented a status report to FMSIC at their last meeting. FMSIC members expressed concern for the lack of a steering group with senior people on it. Betty is preparing a paper that captures the concept of BMIS. The need to interface other systems such as IPABS was mentioned. Pesco will provide Betty with the IPABS requirements document. An Executive Information System meeting will be held on 04/13/99 & 04/14/99. Input for this meeting is being solicited to identify needs and then prioritize the needs.

Travel – A GAO review of travel costs indicated that (1) too many people are coming to Washington, D.C. for meetings, etc. (2) SAI initiatives to reduce travel costs such as benchmarking, video teleconferences, contracted airfare were not used in some parts of the Department. Jon Mathis will send out a list of these SAI initiatives throughout the Department and ask that organizations report on whether they have implemented these initiatives or, if not, why not. Members were asked to provide Lyn a list of SAI initiatives and/or other activities that were implemented to reduce costs and the associated cost savings.

OMB – A recommendation on user fees was requested. Betty is responsible for a report with three options: (1) Do nothing; (2) Do a paper study that would involve selecting two user facilities and conducting a “what if” study in 2000; (3) Select two pilot facilities and actually collect user fees. A paper on this will be available on request.

- Henderson:

The 2000 Budget was officially submitted to OMB. The document format of the budget submittal is now "portrait." A CD that contains the President's and DOE budget is now available. The latest Budget Handbook was issued yesterday (02/16/99). Beginning with the FY 2001 budget, the EWD subcommittee staff have agreed to modify the funding approaches for construction projects. The Department will request separate PE&D Preliminary Design (Title I) and Final Design (Title II) funds for operating- and construction-funded projects with TEC's of \$20 to \$400 million. New construction projects (projects being prepared for FY 2001) with a TEC between \$20 and \$400 million and a total design phase (Title I and Title II) of between 18 to 28 months will be considered for PE&D funding. Generally, full funding (design and construction) will be requested for projects with a TEC between \$5 and \$20 million. There is no change in funding or management of projects with TEC greater than \$400 million.

- The BRC Annual Conference will be held on 04/28/99-04/29/99, Chicago. The next BRC meeting will be held on the afternoon of 04/29. A letter will be sent by Jeffrey to potential attendees asking them for input regarding the agenda and topic selection. Attendees will be given ballots as they enter the event and asked to, during the course of the meeting, develop suggestions for the top priority tasks for the BRC to next pursue. Jeffrey will send Brian a listing of those personnel who are active with the Budget Officers group. Brian will send a list of potential attendees to Lyn, Jeffrey and Jon for review to determine whether or not the BRC wants to invite this full list. Lyn, Jeffrey, Jon and Brian will meet separately to select champions for each of the following topics.

The following is the tentative agenda for the Conference:

Wed

10:30-11:00 BRC Summary (Lyn and Jeffrey)

11:00-12:00 Telson Report

1:15-1:30 BRC Greetings (Lyn and Jeffrey)

1:30-2:00 FMSIC Summary

2:00-3:30 Panel Discussion -- REPROGRAMMING

3:30-3:45 Break

3:45-5:00 Breakout sessions

AFP PROCESS

ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES

LIMITED YEAR APPROPRIATION

## BUDGET OFFICERS

HQ PROGRAM ORGANIZATION BUDGET PROCESS (DP, EM, SC)

DEMO OF DATA WAREHOUSE (?)

DEMO OF EIS (?)

DEMO OF IPABS (?)

Thurs

8:00-9:00 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

9:00-10:00 OMB TOPIC/PRESENTER

10:00-10:45 BRC FUTURE TOPICS BREAKOUT

10:45-11:00 BREAK

11:00-12:00 BRC FUTURE TOPICS PLENARY SESSION

1:00-2:00 OPEN

1:30-? EIS, DATAWAREHOUSE, IPABS DEMO

2:00-4:00 BRC MEETING

Betty Smedley and Bob Pafe will pursue facilitators for the Chicago meetings.

Jon Mathis will work with Warren Huffer and Brian to electronically send the results of the meeting, as well as copies of the presentation slides and any readily available notes, to financial offices throughout the Department.

- Replacement for Bruce Hanni. Nikki Grover of Lockheed Martin NV was selected to replace Bruce on the Budget Results Council. Jon Mathis will let her know.
- Election of BRC Co-Chair. It was decided to retain the Co-Chairs, Lyn Henderson and Jeffrey Fernandez, for one more year. This issue will be revisited a year from now.
- PSO Participation. It was decided that: (1) Brian will confirm with the PSO reps of their attendance 3-4 weeks prior to each BRC meeting; (2) Brian will also send a note to Lyn of this reminder; (3) Lyn will call the PSO reps regarding participation.
- Streamline APF Process. A letter with recommendations was submitted to Mike Telson for his signature. It was suggested that the letter be rewritten. Lyn will rework the letter.
- Reduced Overhead Pilot Program (Pricing of Products). The FMSIC is developing a paper on this topic. Possible options for the pilot are: (1) HQ centrally decides on

overhead reductions or; (2) Local offices determine how much the reduction should be. Impacts of this proposal are (a) CAS compliance and (b) those not getting the reduced rate would be charged a higher rate. The BRC expressed an interest in participating in the development of this paper. Jon Mathis will contact Jim Campbell, who is leading development of the paper, regarding this request.

- **Summary of BRC Accomplishments.** Accomplishments presented at the Annual Conference will satisfy the BRC charter requirements for an annual accomplishments document. The subteam leaders will provide a paragraph to Jeffrey summarizing the accomplishments of their subteam.
- **Limited Year Appropriations.** A report on the impacts of Limited Year appropriations is being reviewed by Congressional staffers. Some armed services committee staffers still support this concept, despite the DOE report. BRC members are asked to provide Lyn with actual examples of how this proposal would be detrimental to DOE.
- **Budget Formulation.** Responses to the survey that was taken were compiled, but there was little consistency of opinion as to what problems exist in the budget formulation process on any issue except that of budget guidance. John Pesco agreed to do a survey to determine by the time of the next BRC meeting just how the Unicall is currently failing to resolve these problems, and to ask for suggestions on how to address this issue.
- **Budget Validation Update.** Response to a request for comments on the draft guidance, three main concerns have emerged. (1) Some of the current guidance, although only suggested, will likely be interpreted as mandatory and would require reviews too extensive to be achievable within current resources. The BRC decision was to take the top priority requirements from the current guidance and create minimum mandatory criteria. (2) There were concerns about field offices being able to get information on program reviews from program offices. The BRC decision was to require program offices to select an individual to act as a point of contact for the field to contact regarding these reviews. (3) There was uncertainty as to what period of time should be covered in the budget validation. The BRC decision was that it should be the same as the fiscal year in which the CRB review for that budget year takes place. There was some discussion of why budgets should not be fully validated before being sent to the HQ CFO/Secretary for decisions. The conclusion was that the budgets sent the HQ CFO/Secretary had been and would continue to be both completely validated for pricing, and adequately validated for program such that valid HQ decisions could be made. A new subteam will be assembled by Jeffrey to create the next draft of the guidance which will incorporate comments received and decisions made.
- The next BRC meeting will be 04/29/99 in Chicago.